



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS

Phéniciens: Essai de contribution à l'histoire antique de la Méditerranée. Par C. AUTRAN. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1920. Small folio, pp. xv and 146. Fr. 30.

This was not an easy book to write and it is far from being an easy book to review; for it involves a survey of the whole ancient history of the Near East, including much of Greece also. The work is done with that refinement of literary quality which we have come to expect as a matter of course from a Frenchman of letters. It displays fine taste, a charming style, and a very engaging spirit of frankness and intellectual rectitude quite evident in the opening words of the Preface: "Ceci est une œuvre 'de bonne foy.' Je ne cherche ni à étonner ni à contredire, mais seulement à me convaincre et à m'instruire." But the author is not unmindful of the serious nature of the task he has undertaken, for he continues: "Aussi ne dissimulerai-je point que vingt ans de recherches et la pratique de la plupart des langues usitées dans l'antiquité, de l'Inde à la Méditerranée, m'ont amené à une conception de l'histoire ancienne assez différente, sous plusieurs rapports, de celle qui a prévalu jusqu'ici."

M. Autran's reconstruction of the course of human development from prehistoric times down through the entire pre-Hellenic age and far into Greek times is indeed new and revolutionary. The main contentions of his book are four (though the author himself does not wholly disengage and treat them separately): (1) that the original source and center of pre-Hellenic civilization in the Near East were in Asia Minor, specifically in Cappadocia; (2) that this earliest culture of inner Asia Minor, styled by the author "Asianic," was subsequently gradually diffused throughout the Eastern Mediterranean and the adjacent lands as far east as Mesopotamia, thus becoming a far-reaching Aegeo-Caro-Cilician-Mycenaean-Phoenician civilization, and that this diffusion was due to *migrations* of the primitive Cappadocians themselves; (3) that the non-Semitic creators and carriers of this civilization therefore *colonized* Palestine and Syria, where they were the real Canaanites and Phoenicians, who were originally non-Semitic; (4) that the Semitic Phoenicians were late intruders who merely inherited the high culture of their non-Semitic Aegeo-Caro-Cappadocian predecessors and then at once fell into decay.

In support of these revolutionary conclusions the author marshals a formidable array of evidence, the great bulk of which is etymological. The

volume furnishes therefore a very useful discussion of words in Greek which seem to be of non-Greek origin—the more useful because all such words, indeed all ancient words and proper names discussed by the author, are fully indexed at the end of the book. The other chief body of evidence consists of the statements which the author has garnered from Greek literary sources of every sort, with which he displays an enviable familiarity. The book also makes some use of archaeological evidence, especially that collected in Père Vincent's monumental *Canaan*; and the author endeavors to show that the archaeological remains also support his reconstruction.

This exceedingly interesting essay of M. Autran thus forces us to take a far-reaching account of stock and to make a searching re-examination of our current general conclusions regarding the course of history in the Near East down to the advent of the Greeks and later. We shall be able to do this best by proceeding from the known to the unknown, or from the imperfectly known to the almost entirely unknown, that is, to begin with the chronologically *latest* of M. Autran's processes, which we have enumerated above as the third and fourth, according to which the Phoenicians and Canaanites were non-Semitic Aegeo-Cappadocians, succeeded only at a late date by the Semitic Phoenicians and Canaanites.

For the sake of clearness we will call M. Autran's original Phoenicians, as he often does, "Aegeo-Phoenicians." The first body of evidence adduced is etymological. For example, in the conversation between Ulysses and the swineherd (*Odyssey*, xv. 417 ff.) we find mentioned a Phoenician named Ἀρύβας. M. Autran (p. 66) contends that this name is neither Semitic nor Greek, but is to be connected with a group of names beginning with *Ar* found among the Carians, Lycians, Lydians, and Cilicians on the one hand, and on the other appearing in Old Testament geographical names like *Arumah* and *Araunah*, or Ἀρβα the name of the giant of the Anakim (Josh. 14:15), whom our author would identify with the swineherd's Phoenician, Arybas. Similarly, "les Philistins viennent de Cappadoce, où leur dieu Dagon paraît, d'ailleurs, avoir laissé sa trace." This trace, as we are told in a footnote, is the name of the Cappadocian town Δάγωνα. After presenting a large body of evidence of this character the author concludes that the etymology of the proper names alone establishes the "Caro-Lycian nationality" of the Canaanite peoples and adds, "C'est là, semble-t-il, un argument décisif" (p. 79). Nevertheless, with his usual engaging frankness, the author admits (p. 81) that these coincidences do not of a surety furnish "une démonstration régulière." Most historical students will without doubt share the author's misgivings at this point.

More substantial historical witnesses are then summoned to testify, and in the author's opinion they show that "the Phoenicians and Canaanites were groups of the same Asianic race, whose destinies are intimately united to those of the Aegeo-Mycenaean civilization which was theirs" (p. 75.) Again, after recalling that in Greek times Asia Minor was strong in "history

and philosophy," our author says: "The Phoenicians are, then, without doubt, a people of Asia Minor, for a unanimous tradition accords them an incontestable priority in all these domains" (p. 52), viz., "history and philosophy." Furthermore, there is an explicit statement in Athenaeus that Caria was once called Phoenicia (p. 53), a bit of evidence which goes back to Corinna and Bacchylides, that is, as far as the sixth century B.C. Historically it would seem that this bit of evidence could only be interpreted as indicating the strength of Semitic Phoenician control or colonization which once extended into Caria. This conclusion would also fit in very well with the author's next item of evidence. Herodotus, says our author, indicates that the ancestry of Thales was Phoenician. Evidence of a much later date follows, and the conclusion is, "The Phoenicians were, then, Carians in origin" (p. 55). Perhaps most of us would rather interpret this evidence more cautiously as showing that *some* of the inhabitants of Caria were Phoenicians. On the basis of Greek literature, reaching no farther back than the sixth century B.C. and most of it far later in date, the author determines the origins of a people who are shown by contemporary evidence of the Egyptian monuments to have been in Syria in the first half of the third millennium B.C. We cannot but ask, What could Herodotus or any other Greek of the literary age know of the beginnings of a people who appear in the Egyptian documents as already in Syria fifteen hundred or more years before the Greeks had learned to write?

Herein lies the weakness of this reconstruction, that it is based so largely on Greek literary documents dating from a time literally thousands of years later than the historical movements under discussion. For if the Phoenicians are to be traced back to Asia Minor, it is evident their migration thence took place at a period so remote that no possible memory of it could be expected in Greek tradition, which failed to preserve any definite recollections back of the Trojan War and the outgoing Mycenaean age. Where in Greek tradition is the slightest echo of their own early northern pastoral life before they migrated southward to the Mediterranean? How much less will they have known anything of far earlier chapters in the life of another and a relatively distant people of Asia!

To this objection the archaeological evidence adduced is not open. It is, however, open to another, equally fatal. Metal-work and pottery and decorative patterns do not demonstrate the *race* of their makers. Vincent's fine summary of Canaanite archaeology proves beyond a doubt the deep impression made by Aegean civilization in Syria. It was a priori to be expected. The interfusion of neighboring cultures is a universal phenomenon, and we cannot expect Syria and the Aegean to be any exception. The wares of the Aegean craftsmen were widely distributed in Syria and Palestine, and without doubt some Aegean merchants may have found their way into the market towns of Phoenicia; but that is very far from making Aegeans of the historic Phoenicians. They may even have begun to copy

Aegean wares, for such imitation was characteristic of the Phoenicians, but this again has no bearing on the racial question.

With his customary intellectual frankness, the author manfully confronts one outstanding archaeological difficulty (pp. 76-78): Why have no written monuments of the hypothetical non-Semitic "Aegeo-Phoenicians" survived to bear witness of them in Syria? He finds the explanation of this difficulty in Herodotus, who states (v. 58) that at a time when the papyrus was scarce the Phoenicians wrote on the skins of goats and sheep. In the perishable nature of the writing material, then, our author would find the reason for the complete lack of written documents surviving from his "Aegeo-Phoenicians." Contemporary evidence some seven hundred years older than Herodotus, however, might have been adduced; for the Egyptian envoy Wenamon of the late twelfth century B.C. carried a considerable consignment of five hundred rolls of papyrus to a Phoenician prince.

But the question arises: Are we in fact so entirely without written documents from the great age of these alleged "Aegeo-Phoenicians"? The author finds the causes for their fall involved in two historic events: the fall of Troy and the Hebrew migration into Palestine (pp. 63 f. and 122), and he would date the incoming of the Semitic Phoenicians, who displaced them, in the period from 1200 to 1000 B.C. (p. 58). The Amarna Letters, dating from the first half of the fourteenth century B.C., are contemporary with the great age of the "Aegeo-Phoenicians," when according to our author these non-Semitic people held Canaan and Phoenicia, or Palestine-Syria. Yet of these three hundred letters the great majority were written by the kings and rulers of Palestine-Syria *in a Semitic tongue*, and these rulers, together with their peoples and their towns, *bear Semitic names*. This is especially true of the cities of Phoenicia from whose rulers the Amarna correspondence contains a long series of letters. In view of these facts, based on contemporary evidence, it is inconceivable that a non-Semitic population should have been dominant in these regions for centuries preceding 1200 B.C. Moreover, it is a fair question to ask why we should so exhaustively question a late Greek onomasticon when we have *contemporary* documents like the Amarna Letters in cuneiform besides the long lists of Syrian-Palestinian towns in Egyptian? But strangely enough, the Amarna Letters, which are absolutely fundamental to the discussion of the questions raised in this volume, are referred to but once in a minor connection (p. 112), and its decisive lists of proper names are never mentioned.

As we examine the evidence for the earlier stages of the "Aegeo-Phoenician" colonization of Phoenicia, we find that the events and the evidence adduced are still farther apart. The first migration of the "Aegeo-Phoenicians" was to Tyre and Sidon (p. 85). The only support brought forward is Genesis, chapter 10, and the Greek myths. The date for this alleged migration does not seem to be mentioned anywhere by the author, but it is

evidently far too remote, as conceived by him, to be demonstrated by the evidence mentioned. No examination of contemporary evidence is offered.

Turning now to the shift of this ancient "Cappadocian" culture and population from Asia Minor to the Aegean and the countries adjacent, we find that the author identifies his Aegeo-Caro-Cilician Phoenicians or Cappadocians with the well-known "Minoan" Cretans of Knossos and the other Cretan centers, and states that they possessed all the characteristics of "la belle race caucasienne" (p. 82). The evidence for this diffusion of Asia Minor population is again really evidence for the dissemination of *culture* rather than the migration of a people. It is drawn from Greek tradition (p. 93) and concerns the outgoing and declining stages of Aegean history, with no light on the situation before 1000 B.C. (p. 94). The lack of dates in the discussion renders it difficult to follow the argument. The migration of the Cappadocians is conceived by the author in successive waves at least three in number (p. 97), the most ancient of which was subdivided into three different "courants principaux," one of which passed into Mesopotamia; a second "by way of Egypt and North Africa [sic] penetrated into the Mediterranean," while the third is the one which reached Phoenicia-Canaan—the one which we have already discussed. The author frankly admits that "the paucity of our sources renders the diffusion of this most ancient wave very difficult to follow." Nevertheless, he uses good and contemporary evidence for the "current" that passed into Mesopotamia. Cuneiform documents of the twenty-third century B.C., found in Cappadocia, have indeed long made evident the connection with Mesopotamia; and that Hittite influences had much to do in shaping the early history of Assyria can hardly be doubted. It is again what we could hardly fail to expect.

The author at first claims only "Asiano-Aegean *influence*" (not migration) in Egypt. No one can doubt it after the fifteenth century B.C., when there was a diffusion of culture influences between Crete and Egypt in both directions; but the contention of this book is that Egypt owed to this "Asiano-Aegean influence" the origins of civilization. But the relative chronology is decisive in this question. At about 2000 B.C. Aegean civilization had reached a point attained by Egypt in the middle of the fourth millennium. The Aegeans gained metal about 3000 B.C.; it was used in Egypt over a thousand years earlier. The author cites the Pyramid Texts, the oldest Egyptian literature, to show that the Egyptians had knowledge of the Aegeans (pp. 100–101). Surely we could not expect it to be otherwise, with the Egyptians coursing the Mediterranean in the earliest known sailing ships in the thirtieth century B.C. After the Pyramid Texts (third and fourth millenniums B.C.) it is a little bewildering to be shifted abruptly to the Old Testament and Herodotus, both some millenniums later than the events they are expected to prove. Old indeed is the evidence of domesticated grains, but wheat and barley, as shown by surviving specimens

from prehistoric burials, were being grown in Egypt in the fifth millennium B.C.; and who will venture to claim knowledge of the culture of Asia Minor at that remote date? In the discussion of these things we find the long current legend of Egyptian indifference to the sea still functioning as evidence without reference to the facts (p. 106). The contemporary monuments of Egypt, beginning in the thirtieth century B.C., make it quite obvious where we are to find the origins of salt-water navigation. Besides the fleets of Snefru in the thirtieth century, they show us those of Sahure in the twenty-eighth, of the Pepi's in the twenty-sixth, and the long series of voyages on the Red Sea from the twenty-seventh to the nineteenth century B.C.—all maritime ventures of the Pharaohs enormously earlier than those of any other people known. At the same time the fact seems to be generally overlooked that a Theban tomb painting not later than the fifteenth century B.C., long ago published by Daressy, displays several Syrian ships at their moorings in the Nile, manned by bearded Semites, wearing characteristic Syrian costumes. Ashore some of the same Syrians are trading in the Egyptian bazaars. It is quite evident that we have here Semitic Phoenician traders landing and trafficking exactly as described by Herodotus. But the decisive point is that their ships are exact models of Egyptian sea-going ships, shown in the reliefs of Sahure as far back as the twenty-eighth century B.C.

Nevertheless, our author advances a step farther and claims the existence of an Aegean colony in Egypt (p. 108) as far back as the Old Kingdom in the first half of the third millennium—a colony which introduced copper, bronze, and the cereals, although these things were known in Egypt at least a thousand years earlier than the date of their appearance in the Aegean. In view of these facts we find ourselves bewildered by the remark (p. 87) that the "Asiano-Aegeans" brought "movement and organization" to a childhood world—a childhood world which had built the pyramids of Gizeh, the greatest monuments ever erected by ancient man, at a time when the Aegeans were just emerging from the Stone Age!

Finally we may notice the author's primary contention that Asia Minor was the original "pre-Hellenic" center of culture, in other words, the cradle of civilization (p. 95). Racially the originators and bearers of this earliest known civilization are confidently affirmed to be Caucasian, for the author avers that the Aegeans brought in "this same Caucasian element, Tyrsenians, Hittites, Syrians, or their relatives, which we know to have been in the entire Mediterranean the active agent of the international exchanges" (p. 109). He refers to it as a "superior element descended from the Caucasus" (p. 87), so that he means a people actually and immediately derived from the Caucasus. But it is clear from the sculptured monuments of Asia Minor that there were at least two racially distinct types among the peoples we call Hittite. The cuneiform tablets of Boghaz Keui have likewise disclosed a group of probably seven dialects. Moreover, it can be positively

demonstrated that the short-headed Alpine type, so evidently that of the old Hittites, cannot be the same racially as that of the Aegeans.

But our author is equally confident on other difficult problems involved in this complicated situation, including the social organization of these earliest "Caucasians." Their society is described as feudal (p. 86), a character which the author frequently mentions, although it is evident that the period when they were still occupying their Cappadocian home lies far back of any adducible evidence. We are here in a world of pure fantasy. Indeed, with his characteristic frankness the author states (p. 95) that "a history, properly so called, of the Cappadocian tribes hardly commences for us until toward the fifteenth century B.C."¹ One cannot forbear the question, How is it possible to demonstrate that a country whose history begins for us in the fifteenth century B.C. (over two thousand years later than that of Egypt, and almost as much later than that of Babylonia) was the original seat of civilization? *When* this civilization arose is nowhere stated in terms of years B.C., but it is alleged to have brought in three things which did not before exist in the Mediterranean world: wheat, oil, and wine. Now the first of these, as we have stated before, was cultivated in Egypt in the fifth millennium, and the second in the fourth, and we must again remark that it is a bold investigator who will affirm what was happening in Asia Minor at those remote dates. Indeed, it is quite clear that the early culture of Asia Minor was always inferior to that of Babylonia and Egypt until Greek times. Equally evident is the fact that the early stages of civilization in Asia Minor were later, and very much later, than those of Egypt and Babylonia.

The author has again demonstrated with conclusiveness that the Greek world was early profoundly influenced by the older cultures of Asia Minor, and his demonstration is accompanied by a very able and exceedingly useful survey of the surviving proper names, which he has used with great skill and effectiveness. While the reconstruction he presents is strong and sound for archaic Greek times, the same direction of the tide of cultural influences cannot be upheld for the pre-Hellenic age. The archaeological evidence demonstrates clearly that for over fifteen hundred years after some 3000 B.C., the mainland both of Europe and Asia lagged behind the Aegean Islands in culture advance, and while traces of Asiatic influence may be found in early Crete probably in the third millennium B.C., the dominant civilization is clearly in the Aegean and not on the mainland. A very simple principle applies here, viz., that between two neighboring peoples culture diffusion is

¹ In this connection the author's statement that at this date we meet the Hittite kings fighting with the great Pharaohs of the Eighteenth Dynasty must be due to some misapprehension. None of the Eighteenth Dynasty kings carried on war with the Hittites. On the contrary, the Eighteenth Dynasty Pharaohs received gifts from the Hittite rulers, and the Egyptian war with the Hittites did not begin until the Nineteenth Dynasty, which is doubtless what the author had in mind.

reciprocal and in both directions, no matter which civilization is the superior and leader. But the mere fact that "people B" has made contributions to the life of "people A" is no good ground for concluding that "people B" is superior in civilization to "people A." Otherwise the presence of potatoes, Indian corn, and tobacco in Europe would demonstrate the cultural superiority of the American savages over the peoples of Europe who received these things from America. It is exactly the failure to heed this obvious principle which has made possible the recent wide currency of a similar hypothesis which would find the original cradle of civilization in a vaguely defined upper Euphrates country (mostly desert!) called in cuneiform records Amurru and identified with the land of the Biblical Amorites.

In conclusion the reviewer is unable to see any reason for changing or even modifying the now dominant view regarding the course of pre-Hellenic culture—the view which finds the rise of earliest civilization quite obviously on the Nile, whence it was diffused through the Eastern Mediterranean, while but slightly later a related culture rose on the lower Tigris and Euphrates, the two forming an Egypto-Babylonian culture complex, which, developing in the intercontinental region of Africa and Eurasia as the earliest nucleus of civilization in the career of man, gradually radiated in all directions through the outlying continental areas, and especially through the Mediterranean, whence our own culture has chiefly descended to us. Some six thousand years later, in a significantly analogous geographical position in the intercontinental region between the two Americas, the *Western Hemisphere* had brought forth another center of radiating culture influences which was crushed by the Spanish invasion. These two primitive centers of culture on the two hemispheres (quite obviously the only two original sources of civilization on the globe) show us pretty clearly where we must look for the earliest germs of civilization in the genial climatic conditions bordering on the tropics, and not in the rigors of mountainous regions like Asia Minor.

For a most interesting and suggestive book, charmingly written, all readers will be greatly indebted to M. Autran; and if his general conclusions differ fundamentally from those of the reviewer, nevertheless the volume has distinct value in many respects—not least in the wide range of other possibilities which it suggests—possibilities so attractively presented that they force us to a searching re-examination of our evidence and our conclusions regarding the origins of civilization and their relation to the rise of Greek culture.¹

JAMES H. BREASTED

¹ The reviewer has noticed a small number of philological matters which might be corrected in a future edition. On p. 35 see *Πάρεσος* (three times). The author has a fondness for the Hebrew *toledah* for "genealogy" (pp. 44, 101), but it should be noted that this word occurs in Hebrew *only in the plural*, and a "généalogie biblique" is always *toledoth*, never *toledah*. The absolute form of the Canaanite pillars is מַעְבֹּרֹת, not מַעְבֹּרָה (p. 61). In the hieroglyphic on p. 72 the sign for *rwd* should be *w*; and on p. 100, there is no hieroglyphic word *rer* meaning "circular"; this old reading has been shown to be properly *phr*. On p. 66 the transliteration of the Canaanite 'rb' should be ²*Aruba*^c, not ^c*Aruba*^c.